

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 21, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONS

Deputy Clerk: — According to order the following petitions have been reviewed under rule 11(7) and are hereby read and received: of the Crossroads Pentecostal Assembly Corporation of the city of Prince Albert, praying for an act to provide for exemption from taxation of certain property situated in the city of Prince Albert; of the Rosthern Junior College of the town of Rosthern, praying for an act to amend its act of incorporation; of the Sisters of Mission Service of the city of Saskatoon, praying for an act of incorporation; of Athol Murray College of Notre Dame of the town of Wilcox, praying for an act to amend its act of incorporation.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the legislature, two grade 5 classes from the Ethel Milliken School in my constituency. They're sitting in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker, and are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Nonnee Garvey, Mrs., or Ms. I think I'll say, Barbara Graham, Ms. Cindy Focht, and Ms. Dawn Vanoss. And I must inform the students and the teachers that unfortunately I will not be able to meet with them this afternoon. I am tied up in the legislature, but I have asked my colleague, the Hon. Gordon Currie, the Minister of Education, to spend a few minutes with you and he has indicated he will do that. I would ask the members of the legislature to join with me in welcoming the group to the legislature this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all the members of this Assembly a group of, I believe, 18 students from the community of Loon Lake in my constituency. They are accompanied here today - 18 grade 12 students - by four chaperones, Glen Leask, Mrs. Voykin, Mrs. McRae, and their vice-principal, from Ernie Studer School in Loon Lake, Derek Punshon. I would say once again, Mr. Speaker, it's not often that from the constituency of Meadow Lake we have students that are able to come to the legislature, because of the distances involved. These people, I believe, are to be congratulated - their school and their community - for the interest they've taken in public affairs in Saskatchewan, and have come here 350 miles to watch the proceedings here today. I would inform them that I will be meeting with you at 3 o'clock for refreshments and answering any questions that you may have. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to welcome and introduce to you and through you to the House 20 grade 8 students from Connaught School who are in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their teacher and chaperones, Mrs. Gail

Jorde, Russell Marchuk, and Byron Bitternose. I trust the students will enjoy the question period, and I'm busy today with the business of the House, but I'm going to try and find 10 or 15 minutes to have some pictures afterward, and then share your observations on what you've seen. So I welcome you here today and hope you find the proceedings educational.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Security at Sask Tel

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Sask Tel. Is it true, Mr. Minister, that seven members of the Corps of Commissionaires employed by Sask Tel have recently been given lay-off notices effective April 30th?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the hon. member that the matter of the security for the building on Lorne Street was put out to public tender. As a result of the public tender, the low bid of 78,000, Elite Security, a Saskatchewan company consisting of former RCM Police officers was the successful bidder.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, is it true that this company is very likely employing these people at a minimum wage then?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, I'm not aware of the internal operations. All I can give the hon. member, that there were three submissions. The three companies, or the corps bidding were as follows: Elite Security - as I say their bid was \$78,977. The second was Guardian Security, \$97,928; and the third was the Corps of Commissionaires at 107,453 - a differential of 36 per cent between the high and the low. I am not familiar with internal operations.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, is it not a fact that most of the members of the Corps of Commissionaires were veterans, and to a great degree looked forward to having some work to do, or some type of employment which they couldn't possibly get anywhere else? Did the department give any consideration to members being veterans, and looking at whether they couldn't provide them with some type of employment?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Yes, it was a matter of concern. We also were getting some pressure from ex-RCM Police officers who are also looking to get into the same type of business. It's a matter of general concern to us. I'm not sure specifically what the answer is. As I say, there were conflicting pressures. We are reviewing, and will review with the Corps of Commissionaires, and have indicated to them by letter that we will sit down and discuss other buildings to make sure that there is a firm understanding of what they can deliver, and whether or not we can work in some of the other ex-RCM Police officers. It's a matter of general concern to us. We are aware of the situation. We were getting, as I say, conflicting pressures from former RCM Police, and the commissionaires.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, a question to the minister in charge of Sask Tel. Our information is that the members of the Corps of Commissionaires - those who have received their notice - were receiving \$5.63 an hour, which does not seem to be too much for a public corporation to pay for security services. Would the minister please look into this matter and see whether or not a way couldn't be found to

employ veterans, at not an excessive salary or a wage of \$5.63 an hour, veterans who I think have some call upon the wealth of the province of Saskatchewan because of the service they have given to their country in the armed forces?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I would be very sympathetic to that review. I would like to keep in mind and advise the Leader of the Opposition we would . . . Any such review would require to target the veterans and make sure that those that have served the country are in fact employed and receive any subsidy if that is necessary. I do believe that we also have to keep in mind that the members of the RCM Police have served this country, as well, and that we do have perhaps an obligation in that area, as well. So I'm quite prepared to review the matter as set out by the Leader of the Opposition. I share his concerns and we will take a very serious look at it.

Work Stoppages at Coronach

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Labour and it concerns the work stoppages at the Coronach and . . . at Coronach over the last day or so, brought about apparently by the unorthodox arrangements which SPC entered into with Provincial Maintenance Ltd., and the primary benefactor of all this appears to be Provincial Maintenance Ltd. Will the minister tell the House whether or not George Hill of Estevan is directly or indirectly interested in Provincial Maintenance Ltd?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, I have no idea whatsoever that Mr. Hill has anything to do with Provincial Maintenance Ltd.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, he's a member . . . New question, Mr. Speaker. I would remind the minister that he's a member of the board of SPC, presumably participated in this unorthodox arrangement. Will the minister undertake to inform himself, as I suggest you should have done before the contract was entered into, will the minister undertake to inform himself and report to the House?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, Sask Power is doing everything in its power to reduce costs for the people of Saskatchewan. We asked for tenders to do the maintenance. Provincial Maintenance was one of the seven low bids. We accepted a bid and what the internal, or whatever is happening out there, is something between Provincial Maintenance and the people that they'll be hiring to do the job. And to the best of my knowledge, that's all that it is. We picked the Estevan one because it was the one to offer us the best deal as far as the costs of maintenance is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Would the minister advise whether or not the contract with Provincial Maintenance was concluded on the basis of information provided by Provincial Maintenance after the bids had been closed?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

Buildall Case

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Insurance. This concerns a lawsuit which Saskatchewan Government Insurance has been prosecuting for a number of years against a company called Buildall and some of its chief officers. My question, Mr.

Minister, is this: since you became minister in charge of SGI, have you changed legal counsel who was acting for SGI on this case?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member yesterday in crown corporation, the answer is yes.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Was your dismissal of the former counsel, Mr. Silas Halyk based upon any reservations about his ability to conduct the case on behalf of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the hon. member is attempting to impugn the name of any member of the bar in Saskatchewan. It certainly was not, I indicated, and answered all of those questions in crown corporations yesterday and I repeat the same answer I gave you then.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, would the minister please repeat the answer he gave then?

An Hon. Member: — Take it out of the record.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. If in fact you were perfectly satisfied with the services of Mr. Halyk, why did you dismiss him?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, for some reason the members opposite, when they were in government, were interested in dragging that case on. It lasted something like six years from the time of the bonding - the default in the bonding - to our being elected government. It seemed to surface very conveniently, at the times of elections, for their purpose and benefit. As I said, the case has been around for some six years, plus the time that we've been there, and we wanted someone to review the case, and we wanted someone that was close to the SGI head office in the city of Regina, and those are a couple of the reasons why we changed the attorney.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, has the case been pursued with vigour during the last year, and if so, what steps have been taken?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well, being a lawyer himself, being a former premier of this province, being the Leader of the Opposition - or at least should know - that any case that is before the courts is not for discussion here or anywhere else.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the question again. Do I take it, Mr. Minister, that you are refusing to tell us whether or not steps have been taken in this case, whether or not there has been any pre-trial conference, whether or not discoveries have been completed - any of those details with respect to the Collver case? Do I understand that?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I have no intentions of discussing a case that is before the courts here or anywhere else.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Question to the minister in charge of SGI. I have no wish to ask anything about the merits of the case before the courts. I do wish to ask whether or not the case is being prosecuted; whether or not the normal steps have been taken. And the question I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, is: during the year

in which your board has had the carriage of the action, has it proceeded with the ordinary steps which one would expect during that year, or has it in fact been stalled?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, it's being handled by counsel, and I'm not going to answer any questions on the case that is before the courts. I will indicate, as I indicated in crown corporation yesterday, that the case has not been withdrawn from the courts.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister indicated in crown corporations that as of December 31 the case was not withdrawn. I now ask you, has the case been withdrawn up to this date, or is there any intention of withdrawing or compromising the case?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I answered that question before this last one, and I said no, it had not been withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister . . . I'll repeat my question, is the minister now discussing the compromise of the case?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — I will repeat again, Mr. Speaker, the answer that I gave the hon. member a few minutes ago, and that is: I will not discuss cases that are before the courts. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I cannot discuss cases that are before the courts.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Prairie Agencies, Weyburn

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of industry and commerce, the minister in charge of SGI. Mr. Minister, yesterday in crown corporations committee, you told the committee that Mr. Ronald Jeffery of Weyburn, a member of the SGI board of directors, was not in conflict of interest situation as a result of the fact that he is also active in the insurance business. And at that meeting you also indicated that you could never recall an instance where Mr. Jeffery withdrew from a board meeting, asked to be excused, because of a potential conflict of interest. And what my question to the minister is: can the minister tell the House if that in fact is the situation, when a company called Prairie Agencies of Weyburn was awarded a contract of SGI to handle the licence issuing responsibilities for that city?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — What's your question?

Mr. Koskie: — If you would listen, I read the question to you. I asked you, in respect when the contract was awarded, in respect to awarding the contract as a motor licence issuer to Prairie Agencies in Weyburn, was Mr. Jeffery in fact a member of the board when that decision was made, and was he present for that decision?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, the appointment of Mr. Jeffery to the board of directors of SGI was made at the request of the independent agents association of Saskatchewan. They had asked for representation on that board for many, many years, and had always been refused admission or representation by the former government. So that when we became government they again made the same request and we honoured that request and appointed, at their choice, Mr. Ronald

Jeffery.

The information that the hon. member is alluding to . . . the charge, or whatever it is he's trying to - the allegation that he's trying to impugn on Mr. Jeffery's character . . . Let me explain what happened, Mr. Speaker. The information re the issuers being appointed was made to the board as an information item coming to the board, and it was included in a complete reorganizational package. No specific reference was made at that time to any individual agent.

We are certainly very concerned about a potential conflict of interest, and before Mr. Jeffery was appointed, we had him checked out (and the appointment checked out) through the Department of the Attorney-General. We were sure that there was no problem; if there was ever anything that would come up, that he would excuse himself from the board meeting and the decision. He has been so informed and that will continue to happen, that if at any time a conflict of interest should arise because Mr. Jeffery is on the board, that he will not be voting and in fact will excuse himself - exempt himself - from the decision.

To answer the question, he was at the meeting, the information was received by the board and he was not part of, nor were any other members of the board part of the appointments made. Those decisions were made by management.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask the minister: is the minister aware that Prairie Agencies, who were awarded the motor licence issuing in the city . . . to be the motor licence issuing agency in the city of Weyburn, that in fact is owned by Mr. Ron Jeffery who in fact is a board member? And I want to say that this is a very, very, very strange situation - that you have, as the minister indicates, a member of the board and then a member of the board obtaining the appointment. I ask you: are you aware of that fact that he in fact is the owner of that agency?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Well, I wasn't aware of the name of the agency that Mr. Jeffery owns. I'll take that as information. I knew he was an agent of SGI in the city of Saskatoon. I will also tell this Assembly that every SGI agent in Weyburn and in Estevan and in North Battleford and in Swift Current, to my knowledge, I may be out one or two in this complete round and circle, but to the best of my knowledge, every agent was offered the same opportunity in being an issuer at the time we made that decision.

Mr. Koskie: — I would like to ask a supplementary to the minister. I would think that the minister agrees that the public has a right to not only expect that there be no conflict, but I think that in a situation that we have here, that the public could be lead to believe that in fact it's very difficult to separate the conflict in the appointment. And what I'm asking the minister: is it going to be the practice that members of the board who are making the decisions for the crown corporations, are in fact going to be able to participate in the contracts of the various crowns, in particular SGI, even if they don't excuse themselves from the decision-making process?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I come back in reply and reiterate the same information that I gave this Assembly a minute ago on how it's being handled and who will be appointed, and the fact is that he was appointed at the request of the Independent Insurance Agents Association of Saskatchewan. The fact is that he's an SGI agent. There are 600 agents in this province; 470 of them are SGI agents. It would be very difficult not to pick one that is an SGI agent, Mr. Speaker. We have done everything, in my opinion, in a very proper way, much different to what the previous government did when they appointed their friends, Mr. Whelan, Mr. Cody - all the

inside information - and the member's brother, and a few other people, Mr. Speaker. So if they want to start going after an individual, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. The member has asked a question. I think it's only fair that you give the minister an opportunity to answer.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of SGI. My understanding of what the minister has just told the House is that the appointment of the company owned by Mr. Jeffery as the licence issuer in Weyburn was a decision made by management and not by the board . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm just doing my preamble, because that is what I clearly understood the minister to say. Well, I haven't asked the question yet.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat. My clear understanding of what the minister said was that the decision to appoint Mr. Jeffery's company as the licence issuer at Weyburn was a decision made by the management, by the president or by the management. I am asking the minister: are you telling me that the president and the management of SGI gives contracts to companies owned by directors, and known by the president to be owned by directors, without the approval of the board?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, as we indicated, the management, concurrence by the board and, as an information item, indicated they were going to appoint issuers in the four cities instead of having issuers appointed by or working under SGI. General policy, Mr. Speaker. And he happens to be one of those agents. I don't believe the management would have had the right to exclude him because he's a member of the board of directors. I don't believe we should punish an individual because he's a member of the board from denying him the right to receive when everyone else is being offered the same opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you telling me, Mr. Minister, that the management feels free to appoint as agents of the company, for any purpose, companies owned by directors without the approval of the directors, whatever the general policy may be?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, the general policy was approved by the board of directors.

PCS Accounting Policy Changes

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several days ago I took notice of a question that I would like to reply for the members opposite. It's to do with the change in the depreciation practice with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say from the outset that I take a real exception to the allegations made by the member from the Quill Lakes, to the fact that we were cooking the books of the potash corporation. I can assure the member opposite that I have never cooked any books in my life before, and I have no . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I would like to suggest also, that you are questioning the integrity of the external auditors, our audit committee, and the management board, and our board of directors.

There are many ways of doing depreciation. We all know that one of them is the straight line, where you take the cost of the asset and base it against the matching with the revenues. We took the unit of production concept because of cyclical potash industry,

and it will give us a truer picture of our depreciation and our assets by using the unit of production. And I would like to remind the member opposite too, that this type of depreciation was being discussed back in June under the former management. So all we're doing is basing it against the unit of production to give a true test of our depreciation assets.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

New Initiatives for Emotionally Disturbed Youth

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in the House today to announce some important new initiatives in the provision of services for the emotionally disturbed youth; more specifically our female youth. For many years, Mr. Speaker, the previous government was very sharply criticized by the courts, the professionals, and the general public, for its lack of resources to deal with troubled youth. I am pleased today to outline, Mr. Speaker, the steps being taken to correct that situation.

We are in the process of developing a number of community-based resources which will include: short-term detention and assessment, long-term treatments, and a unique foster parent program. These initiatives will upgrade as well as replace the residential and treatment services current provided at the Roy Wilson Centre in Sedley. The centre is one for girls.

Mr. Speaker, negative fire reports on this particular centre, which was built in the 1920s, date back to 1968, and for whatever reason, were ignored. The most recent one, from March of 1982, advised us against upgrading the facility and recommended immediate replacement.

We have used this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to develop some new and innovative approaches in dealing with troubled youths, recognizing also the need to decentralize resources to communities other than Regina vicinity.

Our plans, Mr. Speaker, are to develop over the next several months a secure community-based treatment facility in Regina. This home will be a province-wide resource for the most difficult-to-manage cases. Also, a second treatment cottage in Prince Albert with somewhat less stringent security features. The operation of this facility will be contracted to a community agency with experience in that particular field.

There will also be a youth crisis centre in Prince Albert aimed at providing short-term care and assessment services. This centre, Mr. Speaker, will serve as a prototype for the development of similar centres in future years.

We will also be developing a foster home parent therapist program in Saskatoon especially tailored to the needs of disturbed and difficult-to-manage young girls.

Mr. Speaker, we in Social Services and in this government are excited and optimistic about these new developments. They will greatly enhance our capacity to help our young girls assume their rightful place as contributing members of our society.

These resources, Mr. Speaker, will be phased in over the next several months. The Roy

Wilson Centre operation will be scaled down by the end of June to a treatment cottage operation. Once the Regina home is ready the centre will be closed completely. All staff presently employed at the centre will be given a choice to work in one of the new facilities, or in other similar positions around the province. These discussions are presently under way and I am confident that every effort is being made to minimize the unsettling effect which these changes might potentially have on the residents, the quality of the program, and the staff presently in place at the Roy Wilson Centre.

This initiative, Mr. Speaker, has been a long time coming in this province and it is indeed with optimism and enthusiasm for our future that I inform this Assembly today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me respond briefly to the minister on behalf of my colleague, the member from Shaunavon, who is unavoidably absent today. Let me respond in the briefest possible fashion - because that's all your comments deserve - but let me respond in the briefest possible fashion to your partisan comments about the programs carried on by the former government.

Madam Minister, the opposition was sharply critical of those programs, but independent assessments of them were sharply critical of the opposition for an unfair attack on what were basically good programs. But let me deal with your announcement, Madam Minister. The detail of what you're announcing will require some review by the opposition. We want to have an opportunity to look at it, to get the full import of it. We certainly welcome any initiatives by this government to assist emotionally disturbed children and to aid in their rehabilitation. To that extent we welcome it. If, Madam Minister, this marks a change of heart on the part of the government, and if this marks an end to the utter neglect of the needs of the disabled which has marked this government's year in office, then it will be very welcome indeed, and there is so much more, Madam Minister, you could be.

I mention only in passing, the legislation which would make public places accessible to the handicapped which has not been brought forward in over a year. So, Madam Minister, to whatever extent your program is going to assist emotionally disturbed children, we welcome it. If this means that you have experienced a blinding light on the road to Damascus, and you've got a new approach to the disabled - you're going to assist them - then that indeed is very welcome news, Madam Minister.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Annual Report of Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I lay on the table the 1982 annual report of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

Mr. Speaker: — I recognize the Minister of Health . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Sit down then, please. I would just like to caution members. If you come and stand at your desk you are seeking the right to speak and it's a little confusing from here.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (NOT DEBATABLE)

Motions for Returns nos. 107 and 108 transferred to motions for returns (debatable.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 18 - An Act respecting the Department of Economic Development and Trade

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm carrying on from the number of bills that were introduced yesterday. I would like now to introduce An Act respecting the Department of Economic Development and Trade. This new department will include the investment, industrial development, and export promotion and the trade development functions previously in the department of industry and commerce. The objectives of the Department of Economic Development and Trade will include the expansion and the diversification of Saskatchewan's private sector through the development of new markets for export, and the promotion of new products and investment opportunities here at home.

Saskatchewan needs and deserves, Mr. Speaker, two departments of government involving business and the arrangement set forth that will by no means be confusing to the business community. While the Department of Tourism and Small Business will primarily concentrate on maintaining and enhancing the viability of existing small businesses in the province of Saskatchewan, the Department of Economic and Trade will instead provide a high profile agency dedicated to the expansion and diversification of Saskatchewan's private sector through the opening of new export markets and the promotion of new products and investment opportunities within the province of Saskatchewan.

It's no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the old department of industry and commerce never became a significant catalyst in the development of our provincial economy. It couldn't. The old department liked to give things to business, usually nickels and dimes, Mr. Speaker, small-minded programs that businesses ignored for all intents and purposes. Our business men think much bigger. They want to face the world-class competition, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, head on.

Our government has been told time and time again by potential investors of our great province that despite numerous investment opportunities, they were completely discouraged to establish industries in the province, given the oppressive policies imposed by the previous government. Well, Mr. Speaker, an obvious simple task, and our government will continue to implement positive designs to improve the economic climate for the investment of Saskatchewan and the export of goods and services outside the province of Saskatchewan. And the new Department of Economic Development and Trade will play a vital role in making that happen, Mr. Speaker.

I think we simply have to look around through the province of Saskatchewan to listen to the private sector in the province of Saskatchewan. And I can assure you that April 26th was a day that was marked in their minds as a significant and positive new step, a significant and positive new era for the private sector, for the thousands of small business men in the province of Saskatchewan. They often put it to me, even a year later, 'It's just like a breath of fresh air. It's like spring time has come to the province of Saskatchewan.'

And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, small business in particular is the largest single employer of people in the entire province and the largest single employer in the entire nation. And it seems now that not only our government, but many other governments now are tending to follow the lead to recognize the significance of small business, to recognize the significance of the private sector. Without that private sector, Mr. Speaker, we can never recover the way we have to recover, Mr. Speaker. We believe that government and business working together, working together, Mr. Speaker, not in competition with each other, not in conflict with each other, will bring positive results in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — And with that, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to move second reading of Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the Department of Economic Development and Trade.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments. In the closing remarks of the Minister of Finance, I'm not sure in which bill he was talking about, because he has set up Tourism and Small Business as a separate department. And obviously the Department of Economic Development and Trade deals with a different aspect, side, because why have another department specifically designed as small business?

But I just want to say that certainly the development of this province, if it's going to come about in a meaningful way to the Saskatchewan people, that one of the areas that should be developed is the area of small business. Now, obviously, it's not under this one, because they have another department. And I want to say that I concur because, if you take a look at the situation across the world, in Japan, for instance - I was reading a report - a very large percentage of the employment in Japan is done in the small business. And I want to say that any effort by this government to promote the business community that has been established in Saskatchewan and to expand that business community is a welcome effort. Certainly I think that in the past that we had a number of programs which indeed were appreciated by the business community in this province.

I am a little bit concerned, Mr. Minister, in respect to the setting up of a Department of Economic Development and Trade. And my concern is that what may happen is a thrust for international multinational corporations being brought into the province, the capital from foreign countries, because this is consistent with your open for business approach to the development of this economy. I want to say that, really, the emphasis should not be for the multinational corporations to come in and take over our resources and our business sector. Rather we should be giving stronger support to that which we have established and building on that. And that was the direction the previous government was going.

I want to say that undoubtedly, undoubtedly, that is the direction, because obviously what they are doing is the possibility of setting up agents on behalf of the department in other jurisdictions. And of course, just be going to other jurisdictions doesn't necessarily mean that you will not be getting capital for small business. But the emphasis has changed, Mr. Speaker. The emphasis is for the multinational corporation - a welcome mat out for them to come in - and I suspect to the disadvantage of many of the small businessmen in this province already who have established here. For that reason I have concern - concern not in attempting to build an economic base in Saskatchewan. Don't get me wrong. I am concerned with the

direction towards the huge multinational corporations and foreign investment into the province at the expense of Saskatchewan citizens.

I also wonder, to some extent, and it will of course, Mr. Speaker, depend on the government's intention, but I know when we were government, the office of CIC did a considerable amount of work insofar as the promotion and the direction and the investigation of business opportunities in the province, and also carried out the development of joint ventures with many of the companies in the uranium, or in oil, or whatever it may be. And while you say that there'll be no duplication, I wonder whether or not this is evidence that perhaps CIC will be displaced from a role that it carried out fairly actively insofar as the joint ventures with . . . outside capital.

I just want to say in respect to the new department, that the budget is relatively small. And since the department has not been operative, it's very difficult to know of any of the programs or the direction that the government will be going. I just want to say that I note within the bill that there's provision for financial assistance that may be provided by the minister, and when we come to clause by clause, I just . . . If the minister is putting this through the House, I'll be raising a question in respect to clause 11, not a major question. But with those few reservations, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that while we have some doubts as to the direction, the consequences of the thrust of the new government, nevertheless, we do not oppose, in principle, establishment of the department.

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed very pleased to address the Assembly on dividing the department of industry and commerce into the Department of Small Business and Tourism and the Department of Economic Development and Trade. And before I get into my notes that I have, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to take a minute to respond to a couple of remarks made by the member opposite.

And I'm sure, from what I heard him say today, that it's evident that the members opposite still do not understand economic development, and the way it should be done, and the way we prefer to do it, and that is through the private sector.

I'm reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a meeting that I attended, a ministers meeting that I attended in Ottawa last year, when we asked the then minister of industry and commerce, trade division, to implement a two-year hoist of FIRA (foreign investment review agency). When I say we, I'm referring to the ministers in Canada, my counterparts in all the other provinces. And I'm not surprised to hear the member today indicate his concerns because the only minister who objected to our request was the minister from Manitoba, an NDP government. All the other ministers in Canada were quite supportive of the idea of a two-year hoist on FIRA (foreign investment review agency).

The member also indicated his concern about the budget that I have. Well, everything is relative, Mr. Speaker, and I think I have one of the largest budgets available to any minister with my responsibilities. I make some comparisons. I make the comparison, for example, of the previous budget of the department of industry and commerce under their administration, when they had somewhere around an \$11 million budget. The only function of the department at that time was to dole out some grants to small business, and I think my colleague, the Minister of Finance, called them nickels and dimes. And that amounted to some \$3 million to \$4 million in grants, and all I have to say about that is that it cost them about \$7 million or \$8 million to hand out \$3 million or \$4 million dollars. And that didn't make too much sense, and I'm sure that that

certainly wouldn't make too much sense to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Another comparison that I might make, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a population of 1 million people in Saskatchewan, and using a comparison with one state that we have some facts and figures on. That is the state of Georgia with a population of 5 million people have a budget of \$10 million. With a population of 1 million people, we ought to have a budget of almost \$7 million. And that doesn't include the economic development budget that is in the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan's budget of somewhat over \$3 million for economic development in northern Saskatchewan. So, in fact, we have more money than the state, in the United States, that has over 5 million people population. Now, I will revert to my notes, Mr. Speaker, having replied to some of those comments by the members opposite.

My colleague, the Minister of Finance, has outlined in his second reading of the bill the need for creating two new departments, and the Minister of Tourism and Small Business has addressed the advantages of having a separate department to represent the very special interest of small business.

Well I will now speak to you about the need for a department with the mandate of economic development and trade promotion. The government has an economic development policy with the overall objective of providing quality, challenging, and rewarding employment, and of providing self-employment opportunities for its citizens in the short and the long term. The term economic development is often an oversimplified way of referring to a very broad, complex, and yet vitally important and essential element of any society. However, economic development implies new investment, and that is the crux of the situation.

Economic development means investment in new or expanded plants and facilities, in new ideas, and in products. And trade, on the other hand, is an outcome of that new investment. It refers to the process of exchange of the output from the investment, and that exchange takes place with partners, both within and beyond our borders.

Now, while Saskatchewan has the lowest unemployment rate in the country, we can not rest on our laurels. There is always someone who would like to take them away. We have to get new industries moving in the province to create more jobs. Our traditional strengths, our minerals and our agriculture, cannot be our sole source of reliance in our changing world. Third world countries, sooner or later, will likely upgrade their agricultural practices so that they don't have to buy as much wheat to feed their populations. And new potash mines will come on-stream in other parts of the world and, thereby, cut into our sales. New energy sources will be developed to the point where they could affect our uranium markets. The bottom has fallen out on oil prices, yet 10 years ago, oil was a sector which looked like a major revenue-generating area.

Now, I'm not downgrading our resources to the point where we could write them off as major factors in our developing economy in a couple of years. But what I am asking is: where will we be 20 years down the road if we don't diversify into other areas and adopt new ideas? And we owe it to ourselves, Mr. Speaker, and to our children, to think further ahead than one or two or even five years.

The thing you have to realize about the market-place is that new developments are always taking place. We can encourage investment and put provincial money into mining and selling potash and uranium, developing industries to service the potash

and uranium mines, or oil patch. And certainly, there's activity taking place in these sectors and we have great strengths in these areas. However it is imperative that we broaden our activity in other sectors.

In the 20th century society, economic development has been characterized by the emergence of new firms with new and better ideas, products and processes, by constant change. Outmoded ideas, products and processes fall by the wayside, as new ideas arrive. Eventually the new ideas become outmoded themselves. Economic success requires being in the forefront - on the leading edge of innovative and creative projects. Saskatchewan's future success requires active involvement in new ideas, products and processing, and that means investment.

And yet, with all our potential, we only have 1,500 manufacturing companies in the province. Mr. Speaker, although manufacturing is ranked the number one sector in Canada, it is only ranked eighth in Saskatchewan in terms of total output. In all the years of the previous administration, it never moved.

We all know that for things to happen in manufacturing you need the private sector to lead the charge. But no one, particularly the private sector outside the province, knew about the province's tremendous advantages, about how industrial projects can be developed in Saskatchewan towns and cities at a fraction of the cost of cities such as Montreal or Toronto or Vancouver; or that we are in the centre of the strongest regional economy in Canada; or that our primary resources sectors have countless opportunities emerging from them right now.

We have 1,600 acres of serviced industrial land. Our productivity levels in the manufacturing sector are among the highest in Canada and rural areas offer sizeable seasonal labour forces at very competitive rates. And of course, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is a great place to live - thanks due to the changes that we have introduced . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Right. Subsidized mortgages and low gasoline costs.

But none of this information had been conveyed past our provincial borders. During my European mission, Canadian consular staff repeatedly stated that the province had made little to no effort to promote itself to potential investors and their countries. And our profile was about as low as it could get.

But this is not a situation isolated to the European countries that I visited. Others travelling abroad have been told exactly the same thing. In Australia they don't know about us; in Latin America they don't know about us; in Spain, or Portugal, they don't know about us. Time and again, we are told that Saskatchewan is viewed as a grain producer only, with nothing else happening there. In fact, I would bet that a lot of people in the province don't know about our comparative advantages. They know they like living here, but they don't know that as far as a place to carry on business, that it's potential is as great as many, many other locations. We intend to tell the world about Saskatchewan's advantages.

But investment is not enough. To survive in a rapidly changing world we not only have to produce the best products, we have to sell them, and particularly, we have to sell them beyond our borders. Export activity generates significant multiplier effects which are felt throughout the provincial and national economies, producing positive effects on economic growth in terms of employment, income, taxes and balance of payments.

New markets for companies' products enables them to diversify risk by operating in several markets, to expand more rapidly than domestic commerce alone would warrant, to keep labour and capital employed more fully and continuously. It gives outlets for excess production capacity and helps to realize reduced costs through increased production, thus making the firms more competitive.

I would like to have prefaced this lesson on the need for trade promotion with the words, 'We all know the reasons for giving export promotion a new profile.' Unfortunately, the members opposite haven't taken this information to heart.

We have only 200 firms selling out of the province, 200 firms which have indicated that they have the capability to export, or already are. This is an appallingly low figure, Mr. Speaker. Why wasn't there a greater effort to help our Saskatchewan companies market their products abroad? Is it such an innovative and radical idea to work with the private sector instead of competing with it? We have to get beyond our borders to find out what the competition is doing and then do it better. We can use our modern transportation and communication system to make the entire world available to us and to move our products to market. World markets mean world-scale production and related efficiencies.

Now all this tells you very clearly why investment and trade are very important to Saskatchewan in the long term. But why do we need a separate department to make this investment and trade happen? You've all heard about doing one or two things well as opposed to doing many things badly; or, to put it another way, the rifle versus the shot-gun approach.

Unfortunately, the department of industry and commerce was in the shot-gun situation during the past years. Department of industry and commerce had many different things to do, and then was told to take a relatively small staff to go out and do what they could. The department had a very broad mandate which changed in focus as often as did the weather. I was going to say they dealt, but I will say, rather, they were supposed to deal with retail and manufacturing, service and professional companies. They were supposed to provide counselling and, in fact, what they did was to hand out money. And as the Minister of Finance said, nickels and dimes.

For a while, they were responsible for native economic development efforts as a special focus. They were supposed to deal with new investment and exporting - big business, small business, in province, out of province. They supposedly had it all, and supposedly, a lot of things in between.

Well, the first thing that the department reorganization will mean is a sharpening of the focus of both of the two departments. The two departments will complement one another, and we will work together. For example, Economic Development will direct its efforts to attracting investment. Its staff will have the development expertise. But it will work with Small Business in helping a new investor select a site when things get to that stage. And finally, Small Business will take over once the company is established to keep in touch with the company and offer their programs and services.

I will be able to actively assist our Saskatchewan firms assess new markets for their products by increasing the number of trade missions the department participates in. Let me tell you about the experience of the Alberta government since it split its industry and commerce into an Economic Development and Trade Department and a Tourism and Small Business Department. The Economic Development and Trade people were

able to increase their promotion activities, and they've found that by taking their minister with them, they've been able to open doors for their province's companies that would normally be closed to other civil servants and members of the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, it shows that the department is serious in its effort to promote the private sector. It gives credibility to both the government and to the private sector. They are able to get their companies and their companies' products before the right buyers. They have found this particularly successful in dealing with countries where the government is a central force in the managing of the economy. Mr. Speaker, the results have been astounding. In some countries that they have been working with, they have seen a 100 per cent increase in exports to that location. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that we can expect similar results with our more targeted efforts.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

Bill No. 19 - An Act respecting Residential Care Facilities

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, An Act respecting Residential Care Facilities. This particular act is designed to rationalize the health service in the province of Saskatchewan. The continuing care division of the Department of Social Services will be transferred to the Department of Health. The continuing care division, of course, is responsible for the operating and capital grants provided to levels 2, 3 and 4 nursing homes in the home care program.

The purpose of this bill is to provide separate legislation for the residential care facilities component of the continuing care program. This will provide the protection of law in the administration of such facilities, as well as freeing them from the jurisdiction of the Department of Social Services so the transfer can take place. The transfer of continuing care is in keeping with the mandate of the Department of Health, and will ensure the responsibility and the management of the full continuum of care will rest with one agency.

Since the management of acute health care is affected by the management of nursing homes and home care system, having one agency responsible for the entire range of programs should lead to a greater effectiveness in the delivery of those programs. In addition to effective program delivery being gained, it is expected that efficiencies will also be realized through the rationalization of health care facilities and home care programming.

This bill and the transfer of responsibilities to the Department of Health is further evidence that our government is sincerely interested in providing the best possible health care to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, with that I move that An Act respecting the Residential Care Facilities be now read a second time.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm going to comment very briefly, then I'm going to ask for leave, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the discussion on this bill. The critic who would normally handle it is not here, the member from Shaunavon.

Let me just say that if, indeed, this is an attempt by the government to ensure minimum standards and upgrade the standards in residential care facilities - whether that be day care or senior citizens, whether we're dealing with the very old or the very young - you will have our solid support, encouragement and co-operation.

We were the recipients the other day of an official brief from the Saskatchewan nurses, and they indicated that in their view there may be room for some improvement. And they also indicated that didn't necessarily start with this administration, so I don't make it as a partisan comment. So, if this bill is an attempt to upgrade the standards of the care given to the young and the old, you have our co-operation, support, and encouragement.

Given the fact, however, that the member for Shaunavon is not here and, I think, has certainly not passed his comments on to me, I'd ask for leave of the Assembly to adjourn the bill.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 20 - An Act to amend The Department of Rural Affairs Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill will change the title and the focus of the department of rural affairs to the Department of Rural Development. Our government is committed, Mr. Speaker, to the well-being of rural communities and is prepared to take an active role in rural development. This bill will clearly demonstrate this government's intention to strengthen our commitment to that goal of rural development. It's been already demonstrated by the various proposals already undertaken by our government, Mr. Speaker. To name a few: the rural gas distribution system. While the members opposite tend to smile and laugh about that, the people out in rural Saskatchewan clearly are not smiling and laughing the way the members opposite are. They are very thankful for that type of program being delivered, as well as the new initiatives being taken by this government with regard to try to get a grip and a handle on the whole question of water delivery and water policy in the province of Saskatchewan.

A commitment: there is no way this government will ignore agriculture. The government of this province has its roots in rural Saskatchewan. And the farmers and the agricultural people within this province, I think, are very thankful of the attitudes, of the policies of this government with regard to rural Saskatchewan and with regard to agriculture. Agriculture is important to this province. It's the number one industry in this province. It always has been the number one industry in this province, and it always will be the number one industry in this province. We are committed to agriculture. We are committed to agriculture like no other government in this province has ever been committed to agriculture. And with that, I move second reading of this bill, An Act to amend The Department of Rural Affairs Act.

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I found it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance was on his feet regarding Bill No. 20, and what this bill really does is just change the name from rural affairs to Rural Development. And I noticed he had some difficulty in trying to find something good that was going to happen because of this name change. He went on about talking regarding rural gas extensions, which I wasn't aware was administered by rural affairs, or the new Rural Development department. He talked about agriculture, which they were interested in, and felt that it

was number one. I found some difficulty trying to put that, tie that together with Rural Development. Mr. Speaker, this bill does very little more than just change the word 'affairs' to 'development.'

I see nothing in the bill really that shows anything that has strengthened the department any. The minister and the Premier, as in the past, said that this new department was going to be strengthened in some way or other. But we don't see anything in this bill that would indicate any kind of strengthening. In fact, Mr. Speaker, what we see in rural affairs is that the budget does not provide even what was being provided in the past. We've seen a decrease in the budget, if anything. So if anything is going to happen from the name change of rural affairs to Rural Development, it is going to be nothing more than less for rural Saskatchewan.

We've had, Mr. Speaker, budgets for different departments discussed in this House, and this one is nothing different, in rural affairs, as to what's been happening in other departments. We've got a minister of pot-holes in this province, and I can only say that this name change to Rural Development is going to create nothing more than a minister of rural abandonment, and not an improvement to the program. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, to prolong the discussion on this bill because it doesn't change anything. All it's going to do is waste the time of this House and cost the taxpayers money, so with that, Mr. Speaker, I will allow the bill to proceed.

Hon. Mr. Pickering: — Mr. Speaker, I listened very, very closely when the member from Pelly was talking about what we were not going to do with rural affairs, and as it relates to you saying we're just changing the name, and you mentioned something about wasting time in here: I will tell you something about wasting time. When you got up on the throne speech debate, and indicated to this Assembly - and talk about misleading the Assembly - where we took out of our budget in rural affairs \$407,400 for the Qu'Appelle scenic route. And the reason we took it out . . . That was the federal government's portion, and we completed the road last year. So we decided we wouldn't do it again this year, because it costs too much money, you know, to rip it up, and then regrade it, and put a top on it, and so on.

We are going to be looking at programs in Agriculture - all types of programs that we can help administer as it relates to rural affairs. Agriculture is a very big department, and there are programs in there whereas we're dealing with exactly the same people, the rural taxpayers, or all farmers within the province of Saskatchewan. We will enhance the department in the coming months, and I'm certainly sure that you'll see a change, and the people in rural Saskatchewan are looking forward to it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and by leave of the Assembly referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 10 - An Act respecting the Department of Tourism and Small Business

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — You want the officials? Yes. Gil Johnson, deputy minister, Continuing Education; Mike Costello, Department of Finance.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if I might ask the minister whether or not this bill effects any changes but the establishment of a new department with the usual powers, with the usual name. The departmental bills have assumed a fairly standard form and I wonder if you could tell us whether or not this is anything other than the standard form for creating a department. I didn't see any but I may have overlooked something here.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — In response to that, the bill does not put (if you are looking for it), new twists into that particular department. What it is is a standard bill to effect the transfer of jurisdiction over the areas that we have indicated in second reading speech formerly with the department of industry and commerce over to the new Department of Tourism and Small Business, plus the components from tourism that are being transferred. It's a clean transfer of existing areas.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 11

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . What's your problem?

I've a question on section 11, Mr. Minister, and that's in respect to financial assistance.

The minister may, for any purpose relating to any matter under his administration, for which he is responsible, provide financial assistance with respect to any programs . . .

I note there that whereas the grants have a limitation as to the amount that the minister can make, up to \$10,000 I believe, and over and above that he goes to the Lieutenant-Governor for permission for grants exceeding \$10,000. And what I'm asking is: I'm wondering whether or not the full amount, the full power should be allowed to the minister in respect to section 11, or whether or not a limit should be in fact placed there. In other words, \$10,000, and then over and above that go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Or do you feel . . . What is the purpose of leaving it open-ended, where apparently the amount of assistance that the minister can make is unlimited, subject to his budget, I would think?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I am advised that the clause 10 before that, which is the standard granting clause with a \$10,000 limit, that the legal advice on the drafting of that particular legislation, that those granting things can cover situations or not cover situations as related, let's say, to reimbursements or something. You see, the interpretation or the reading of that 'provide financial assistance with respect of any programs in accordance with the terms and conditions that are prescribed in the regulations,' - well, all money like that has to be voted in the legislature, in that it is a clause put in by the legal people, apparently to clear up some of the problems associated with the granting section in such intents. It's not designed, if the question was, to launch some new program or circumvent the legislature in any way with regard to appropriations.

Mr. Koskie: — I'm not suggesting that to you, Mr. Minister. The concern that I have is that in respect to grants in the previous section, it indicates a limitation in the amount that the minister can make a grant on his own - up to \$10,000. Okay? Over and above that, he requires the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council - over \$10,000; I believe that's right.

Now when you get into section 11, financial assistance, so if he enters into a program of assisting a given organization or agency or person, as the legislation indicates, I say that there is no limitation there other than, I suppose, the limitation of the appropriation in the budget - the control by his budget. But I'm just wondering why, in respect to grants, do you have for the limitation up to \$10,000 without having to go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but here it's open-ended? In other words, the appointed minister can in fact presumably make any amount of financial assistance. And that's my question: why do you keep it open-ended, rather than going similar way as with the grants - that is the 10,000 and over and above that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council would give approval?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — As I understand, in response to that, that what would happen, anything over \$10,000 would have to go to an order in council in order to get that grant over \$10,000. Under the second one, the order in council would have to be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I was trying to explain section 10, that you indicated that if you go over \$10,000 you then have to have an order in council to approve it. Okay? This one here, the order in council would, prior to any granting of it, would have to set up the terms and conditions by which anything would flow out under that payment to it. So that the terms and conditions are set up on the order in council or the regulation, as to how it would be paid.

Mr. Koskie: — No, the section says:

And in accordance with any terms or conditions that are prescribed in the regulations to any person, agency, organization, association.

Certainly it's absolutely no reference to terms and conditions as set out in the order in council. It's simply a question of in accordance with the terms of the regulations, not the order in council. And what I'm saying, section 10 has the minister going back if it's over \$10,000 and getting an OC (order in council). Here it seems to be open-ended. Now, you may have a reason for that, and that's really what I'm attempting to clarify.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, no. What I'm saying is: under section 10 you basically empower a minister to make grants up to \$10,000. Anything over that would have to go to cabinet to have approval of it, okay? Under this situation, by regulation which must be approved by Executive Council, by cabinet . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, to pass the regulation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, okay, if I can read it to you:

Provide financial assistance with respect to any program, and in accordance with any terms and conditions that are prescribed in the regulations to any person, agency, organization, association, institution, or other body within or without Saskatchewan, or outside Saskatchewan.

So what I'm saying is that the legal interpretation is that in order to use section 11, it would have to have a regulation establishing what areas could be paid, what

allocations could be made, and then that would go according to this. Both of them have to be appropriated, obviously. One you could make by way of a grant; this one you make, in advance, a regulation setting out how those payments could be made.

Mr. Koskie: — Yeah, I follow what you're saying. In section 11 then, you're not including any specified limitation, but will, as you indicated, be doing that by regulations and the terms and conditions of those regulations. And what you're saying is that to pass the regulations, the cabinet has to approve them and there's control to that extent.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to.

Clause 14

Mr. Shillington: — Often these regulation clauses specify the purposes for which the regulations may be passed and I guess this is the regular departmental section, in a sense. It says 'and to pass any regulation required or authorized by this act.' So, yes, I guess it's normal form. Sorry.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clauses 15 and 16 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 8 - An Act to repeal The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 9 - An Act respecting the Department of Supply and Services

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I just wondered if the members opposite had the House amendment with regard to clause 14(3)(b)? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Good, so did I.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6

Mr. Lusney: — On clause 6, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the minister has allowed for an advisory board or a committee on there, and it really exempts him having to go through order in council to account for the money he may be paying the advisory board. There is no real audit required of what goes to that advisory board, so that it

would appear in this clause that the money you pay to an advisory board that you've set up or the numbers involved, really are not covered off if you do not have to go to order in council to provide those figures.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We'll attempt to get you an answer for that. The counsel is outside, and if you can just be patient, we'll get back to you in a minute.

Mr. Lusney: — I have plenty of patience. I might add to the minister for Moosomin. Clause 6 and 7 are basically the same, if I could say so, Mr. Minister. One is regarding advisers, and the other one is setting up an advisory committee, which this same question would apply to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Okay. The clause 7(2) you're concerned about - that requires Lieutenant-Governor in Council approval. Okay. If you'll just be patient we'll have it. I'm advised that this is a standard clause in most pieces of legislation existing now, number one. Number two, it entitles the appropriate minister to hire by contract, services of a consultant, if you like. That is not new to government, number one, and number two, it obviously is open to audit and control by the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, are you saying that you can hire advisers or consultants without having to go to order in council or get order in council approval for the hiring of these people?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yeah, I mean, that's been in existence in government for some time. This is no different than it was up until now and before, and for you in the good old days.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7

Mr. Lusney: — On clause 7, Mr. Minister, that applies to the committees that you may set up. And again, this seems to leave it open where, if the committees are appointed for less than a year, you really have to have no record of it or do not have to justify it to anybody through order in council as to the committee that you hired, set up, or the amount that you're paying them. Is this what's really going to be happening? If you can get them in there for less than a year, there really will be no record of them even being in there.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No, I think, if you go to 7(2), it's six months. Anything over six months is by way of advisory committee, you have to have approval of cabinet, in effect. It's designed . . . It's not an uncommon clause in many pieces of legislation of departments. It's geared to allow the department the leeway of being able to not have to go through what you could appreciate sometimes as getting it through the whole mechanism. It's to allow a department or a minister to get a short-term advisory committee, let's say to handle a specific problem, delegate that out to a committee, come back with a recommendation, clearly not something designed to run on for a long time. It's a short thing, and it's allowed the flexibility of the department to handle that situation. I think it's appropriate. I think the six-month clause, which is a standard clause in most legislation, is a reasonable thing.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 12

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, under clause 12, again this seems to . . . The revolving fund is something we've gone through before, so I won't get into that one again. This seems to allow the minister or the department to get into getting services or competing, so to speak, with computer services of the government. You can get them from outside of government, or you can even go outside of Canada really and tie into the whole system without having to go through, say, SaskComp or a department of government.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Am I to understand that what you're saying is that you wanted this clause to say that you have to go through SaskComp? Well, there was no restrictions before to the hon. member under advance account. He could always work the advance account. No, this is simply a revolving account. As we indicated before, that revolving account is demonstrated in the estimates of this particular department. Any questions with regard to that, as to what they might be using it for . . . but it gives them the flexibility and gives them no more flexibility than they had before in the advance account.

And a question with regard to the policy, whether or not you're going to . . . where the minister is going to end up with advice with regard to the computer programs of government, certainly we're not about to restrict that, that it can only be done through SaskComp.

Mr. Lusney: — Well, there doesn't appear to be any provision here that would require an audit of the money spent for computer services. Could you indicate whether there is?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think that when we went through the advance accounts and the revolving accounts before, what I indicated is that pursuant to the legislation this is an expenditure and a budgetary item now coming out of the Consolidated Fund, and by that very nature subject to review and audit by the Provincial Auditor. So it is there clearly without any question about it.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clause 14 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 18

Mr. Shillington: — There's a change in the wording, and the present wording appears to be more restrictive than the former, and I just would ask the minister for a comment on the difference. The former wording was a report required on 'all works under the control of the department.' The present 18 says, 'respecting the works performed by the department.' So you've gone from 'all works under the control of the department' to 'all works performed by the department.' I'm wondering why you changed the wording from the former act.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Again, we'll have to ask legal counsel. We can . . . It'll just be a minute.

Mr. Shillington: — If I can just make a comment while we're waiting. It strikes me that if you contracted out any services, and they were performed by someone outside the department, that would be included in the former wording, 'under the control of the department,' but not under the present wording, 'to be performed by the department.' So I say to the minister, you may have advertently or inadvertently excluded from the annual report those activities which might have been contracted out. And it's a potentially . . . If it was inadvertent, then let's change the wording back to the old one. If it was advertent, I'd like to hear an explanation for it. I appreciate you're waiting on legislative counsel.

Mr. Chairman, you have our undertaking that if you adjourn this and go on to some other bill we will give leave to return to this as soon as you want to call it.

Bill No. 11 - An Act to repeal The Educational Communications Corporation Act

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 5

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions here in respect to section 5. What I am concerned with is that section 5 places a limitations of actions as against the Executive Council or any officer or employee of the Crown for any loss or damage suffered by a person as a result of the repeal of the act.

What I'm asking is that a number of employees out there have been dismissed, terminated, jobs have been eliminated, and my concern particularly in putting into effect this section: are you not in fact curtailing any rights of legal action to an unreasonable settlement by this government to any of the employees?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — As I understand it, in response to your question, number one, that any employee that was terminated as a result of this particular move . . . Settlements have been reached with regard to severance pay to all of those employees. So I question whether or not the point you raise with regard to employees is valid. I think it's again a legal thing relating to some contracts, that type of thing.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, it's certainly not restricted to contracts, and let's not leave that impression. It's 'no action lies against the Crown' and it doesn't say 'no contract action.' I think it generally does in fact apply, and would in respect to what you're saying, but certainly, what I want then: is the minister saying categorically here that by approving this section that no employee which has been . . . jobs have been eliminated or hired, fired, whatever you want, will not be affected? In other words, because I take it very clearly that this section, if there were people out there who were wanting to seek legal recourse, that this section would preclude them from proceeding and that they would be at the hands of the government opposite, and I would certainly not wish that to occur on the record to date of this government.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — . . . (inaudible) . . . will unequivocally give you that assurance.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clause 7

Mr. Shillington: — Does the educational communications corporation in fact have titles in their own name? I know that's not a riotous issue, but I'm surprised to find that they actually have real property in the name of the corporation. Is that in fact accurate?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, let's put it this way: whether they do or don't, if they in fact do, this particular section covers it, and it's designed for nothing more than having to go through the role of transferring titles through The Land Titles Act.

Clause 7 agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 9 - An Act respecting The Department of Supply and Services

Clause 18 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We can now revert back to Supply and Services bill, and we'll try and give you an answer on that question. I am advised by the officials from the Attorney-General's department that the clause is a standard clause that is contained in all bills. It's designed in no way to try to confuse, mislead, or anything else.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have a question of the member. Would this section obligate the department to report on activities contracted out, and thus not performed by the department?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think in response to that you would go back and ask your question with regard to the wording. Remember, the annual report is not like, let's say, the audit of the Provincial Auditor. The audit of the Provincial Auditor must go through all expenditures of money. An annual report it tends to be . . . well, it follows a standardized tradition or form of being reporting. That reporting decision basically rests with the minister of the department.

I will give an example to the hon. member. If your argument is to the effect that, let's say under the previous government, the Department of Agriculture, for example, contracted for services to someone to provide some contractual services. That would not normally be found in the annual report of the Department of Agriculture, unless that particular minister decided that he wanted that in the annual report. There's no obligation to put it in the annual report. However, there would be an obligation on the auditor to audit that information. And, of course, that information would be seen in the *Public Accounts*, or could be questioned of the auditor as to whether it was appropriately spent or not. And, of course, it could be asked in estimates: are you going to spend any money for this, that or the next thing, or contracting out; if so, to who or have you contracted out? - or for written questions.

I think it is clearly not designed to do anything with regard to that other than to a standardized clause from the Legislative Clerk's office to deal with that.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. While I take the minister's word for it that this is not part of a dark sinister plot to deny the information the opposition need to perform their function, I may say, and I'll leave it at this, I like the old wording better. And if that counts for anything, I wish for future references to go back to the old working; I think it was more comprehensive. But I'm going to let this section go.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'll take your advice under advisement.

Clause 18 agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 12 - An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, just confirm that this act relates to the transfer of ambulance services, and is nothing more than that.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That is correct, but I don't like the term, 'is nothing more than that.' We find that to be a very significant move, and we believe it's something that the people of Saskatchewan want, the ambulance drivers want, the hospitals want, municipalities want, everybody wants. I think it's a very positive move, and it's very good.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 14 - An Act respecting The Department of Justice

Clause 1

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to raise one item of concern. If we look at the previous Attorney General's Act, and specifically under section 5 and section 7(2) of The Attorney General's Act, they provided . . . Under The Attorney General's . . . It says:

The Attorney General may establish a program for the provision of legal aid to persons in respect of such civil and criminal matters as may be designated by the regulations.

That's section 5, and section 7(2), it went on to say: 'Without limiting the generality of subsection (1), the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations . . .' And there it goes into prescribing a tariff of fees payable to members of the society who provide legal services under the program, prescribing procedures for administering the program established under section 5.

So the whole system of legal aid is a part of The Attorney General's Act. When we go through the new Department of Justice, and because of the statements that have been made and the condition that has been set up, we have some concern as to why this new act on the Department of Justice would not in fact contain provisions, as does The Attorney General's Act under section 5 and section 7(2). Could the minister advise?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The reason for that is that when The Community Legal Services Act was introduced those two sections were inadvertently omitted to be repealed. They become redundant; they're not needed and are covered by The Community Legal Services Act that . . . Is that going to satisfy you?

Mr. Koskie: — Yes.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I'm surprised to see this section, and I wonder what the powers and duties, which belong to the Attorney-General solicitor of England, we're transferring to the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan. What's included?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised it was in the act before. Nobody was completely sure what the powers of the Attorney-General of England were, but we weren't about to lose any of the ones we did have.

Mr. Koskie: — In preparing your legislation, is it the practice to include sections which you do not know the purpose of? You said it was in the last one, and that's the reason for having put it into this one. I guess what we really would like to know is: is there any . . .

An Hon. Member: — The list - the list of powers.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, we want to know the list of powers in order to know whether or not we should really delete it at this time. Because certainly the reason that you gave, Mr. Minister, is hardly one that would satisfy the opposition on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I wonder if you would undertake this undertaking that I will, at some point in time in the future, provide that information for you. Would that be good enough?

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clauses 11 and 12 agreed to.

Clause 13

Mr. Shillington: — And is that . . . The section giving the minister the power to enter into agreements on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, is that a lift out of the old AG's act? I asked this in section 12 because I thought this was the responsibility of the minister of intergovernmental affairs. I thought this was no longer the responsibility of the Attorney-General and the Attorney-General, I gather that he just finished

repealing the intergovernmental affairs act. So I'd just like to know where this sits now.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The intergovernmental affairs act being repealed; this is in every act now.

Mr. Shillington: — And it was in the acts we just finished passing? I didn't see it but I . . . For the benefit of those opposite who may not have heard it, we just finished dealing with three acts and I didn't see the section in those three acts. So I'm wondering if, the minister says it's in every departmental act, I'm wondering if that's, in fact I'm wondering if there's not some confusion.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Section 9(1) in Tourism and Small Business for example.

Clause 13 agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 18 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 15 - An Act respecting the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources

Clauses 1 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 13 as amended agreed to.

Clause 14 agreed to.

Clause 15

Mr. Shillington: — Well, that's fairly broad. It's swoop into someone's house in the dark of night. Is this a lift out of the old section? Is this a lift out of the old act? Where did you get the wording from?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I am advised by my officials that they are 99 per cent sure it's identical, but we could check the act if you wish. It's certainly not designed to be anything different.

Clause 15 agreed to.

Clause 16

Mr. Shillington: — What's your thinking behind this, Mr. Minister? Why limit liability to that of negligence?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The purpose of it that of course the Crown can't enter upon land. That's the reason it's for. And if they do, they cannot be sued for trespass. If they are negligent and create damages, of course the Crown would undertake that obligation to cover that negligence.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, goodness gracious, Mr. Minister, why didn't you limit it to that? You have absolved yourself for any responsibility in contract, any responsibility in libel, slander. If that was the intention, why didn't the section say so?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I suppose it's the old section, and I suppose we can look at whether or not it's a proper thing with regard to . . . You know, as you I think are aware, most legislation written by government has that type of a clause in it with regard to exempting it. I think it extends as well to the question of good faith; 'except in the case of negligence, for loss or damage suffered by reason of anything in good faith done or omitted to be done under the authority of this Act or the regulations.' So the good faith clause is there.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I am told by my colleague that this section, in fact, first appeared last year and was not there before 1982. I frankly think that the breadth of this thing is objectionable. You are exempting the Crown from liability under a very broad range of activities. If you can in some way or other establish that what was being done was being done under the authority of the act, and I suppose anything the minister does is done under the authority of the act, then you're not liable for it unless you can bring your action of negligence, and that really is a very broad exemption. And I know this isn't going to cause rioting in far provinces, but I do, Mr. Minister, find the breadth of this thing objectionable. If you just want to give yourself an exemption for trespass to land, why don't we here and now amend the section to say so?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We'll check the legislation to see if it's a standard clause.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if we're waiting for the legal advisers again, they seem to be a hard crew to keep around. Ah, there he is.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that it's almost identical wording, and certainly in any legal, or intent, to the wording in the 1974 tourism and renewable resources act. So it's not something that came in last year; it's virtually identical to '74.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, when you say it's virtually identical to the one, I think, that was brought in in 1974, I beg to differ with that because that was not . . . I think the wording was not identical to what's in there now. You've made some changes where you absolve the department or the minister, or anybody connected with the minister or department of any liability whatsoever, and I believe that just come in in an amendment last year. If you have the old act there, maybe your officials can just check into it. I'm not questioning what you're saying here, but I just don't want to have it left saying that that was part of the old act, that the wording was the same and the intent was the same, because here it leaves the minister or the department without any responsibility for damage to anyone.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — As I understand this, this was taking from the loose-leaf of tourism and renewable resources. So it did not contain the amendment from last year, and it's identical. And if you look at that, it indicates '74, chapter 31, section 28. That was the time that that particular amendment was brought in. So it was brought in in the year 1974. What's in this legislation here is identical to it.

Clause 16 agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 17 - An Act respecting The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 6

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the minister: in respect to clause 6, for the purposes of exercising any of the powers or carrying out any of the duties imposed under the act, the minister may engage, it says, 'the services of or retain technical, professional or other advisors, specialists or consultants.' I take it that in respect to the section 6, there's no limitation in respect to the amounts that can be paid out in respect to advisers. Is that accurate?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes. It's the same as the other sections. I suppose it's the money has to be appropriated, and that's the protection. It's like saying that there's no limit on the amount of money that can be spent in the Department of Health, except it has to be appropriated.

Mr. Koskie: — But if you go to section 11, you will find a specific limitation in subsection 2 - 11, subsection 2 - where in fact it puts limitations on the amount that the minister can enter into contracts, up to \$10,000 without the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. So don't give me the story that it's just a question of appropriation. I mean, you do in fact have a limitation on all contracts except as it refers to section 6 and 7. I have two questions. Why not have a limitation in respect to 6 and 7 as well as in respect to other contracts as set out in 11(2)?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I suppose it's the same, and I suppose the decision is that we have . . . I take it that if you are going to hire a consultant, many consultants are over \$10,000, and you know, it's not something that you normally would have to run through cabinet. If so and so is going to be hired for \$12,000 or whatever it's going to be, it still has to be appropriated, it still has to be accounted for. And you know, so it doesn't go to cabinet or not go to cabinet, it seems to me the same as before, it's the same argument as before.

Mr. Koskie: — You know, you aren't really addressing the essence of the question. Because in one section you put a limitation in respect to \$10,000, and you don't in respect to section 6 and 7. And what I'm asking is if you deem a limitation desirable in one respect or in certain instances, why is it not also desirable in respect to obtaining advisers? Surely there's not that many that it would clog down the system of merely getting the approval from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. You see, the thing is that there's . . . If we have it with the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, Mr. Minister, we have a notice of that - that an OC is passed authorizing the minister, and that we have here is that in respect to these advisers and consultants and advisory committees, we are not given that privy. And what I am concerned about is why exclude these and prevent the opposition from having early access to the deeds of this government.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — All I can say is that it's the same type of legislation that was introduced in the other one. I can assure the members opposite that any consultants that would be hired by this government would be of the first and top quality, and would be used for the betterment of the department, and the betterment of government.

Mr. Shillington: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, without being too provocative, if you could tell us why you wouldn't disclose, why you wouldn't have the same control over

expenditures in this area as you do in others? I just don't quite understand your reasoning. I hear your comments that your consultants are of the highest order, and I take that to be the gospel. I wouldn't quarrel with that, but I didn't quite get a crisp response to the answer for the member from Quill Lakes.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, the only thing I can say is that, clearly anything hired is going to be shown in the *Public Accounts*. It is going to be shown there that you can ask any questions as to, and as you have in each of the estimates, as to whether or not there has been any consultants hired, and who they are, and orders for return. And that information comes, and it's just really cleared and designed to expedite a bit the working of cabinet. That's all it's for.

Mr. Koskie: — A further question. You have a new department, the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, and I suppose what I am concerned with here is that you continually tell us that this is an open government. And when we give you here an opportunity . . .

An Hon. Member: — Opportunity to open, to really show that you do . . .

An Hon. Member: — Proclaim your virtue to the world.

Mr. Koskie: — That's right, a kind of concrete way. You get up and just say: 'Well, oh, it's just the way it's done.' And we're very concerned with this, because there could be very large sums of money paid to consultants, and obviously not out on tender basis, or any of that nature and we're concerned. And certainly, our early attention to it, I think would be most meaningful in taking care of huge expenditures made by a given minister which here he has no restrictions other than his budget. And I think that it's an omission for a purpose which you aren't prepared to tell us. And I regret that fact.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think that, clearly, let's get it straight, that nothing is being withheld. Any information that we have with regard to anybody would have to be shown in *Public Accounts*. We try, or we're going to try to expedite the process of cabinet to make it faster. We will look at open government, perhaps, as opening your door to be able to hear the concerns of the people, and from that point of view is how we look at it.

Mr. Koskie: — Not to make a big deal out of this, but I'm saying, Mr. Attorney-General . . . or Mr. Minister of Justice . . .

An Hon. Member: — No, not yet.

Mr. Koskie: — Not yet, eh? Not proclaimed.

You see, what you're telling us doesn't seem to make a lot of sense, because, in some instances, you say: we want to limit contracts that the minister can enter into, limit those to \$10,000, and beyond that he needs the approval. Now by the very fact that you have that in the act, you seem to recognize our concern.

But then you go into a couple other sections and exclude them. Now, if it's because consulting firms charge a lot and go beyond the \$10,000 very often, but there must be a better reason than what you have pronounced. Because if it's, you know, sort of good for the goose, it's good for the gander, type of thing. If it's good to restrict in one instance - and there has to be a reason for it - then it should be good to restrict where the potential expenditure is larger, in my view. And that's what we're asking.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, I think the first thing we have to bear in mind is that before this legislation came in, as you are fully aware, that any contract that, let's say, was entered into by the previous government - any contract entered into by the previous government - required no disclosure, required no 10,000 rule. What we are doing is bringing in this 10,000 rule, and we're, I suppose in a conservative way, moving it in a step by step process.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I really don't want to continue the debate on it. And I really think that we have to get a serious answer from the minister. I mean, I asked him a perfectly legitimate question here: that if a 10,000 limitation is placed on a minister in respect to all of the major contracts, then why the exclusion for section 6 and 7? And surely, when you drafted it, or your officials, you must have had a reason for excluding it. And what I want to know is the reason, not a political speech from you.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Under section 11, if we can go to section 11, we're talking about agreements. Okay? And agreements would tend to go to cabinet, and something that we would want to review as an agreement. With regards to hiring a consultant, or hiring advisers - something to this effect - we're leaving it the same way in effect, for all intent and purposes, as it was before, and leave the minister with the discretion to do that. You make a lot out of something that certainly it's not going backwards.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to close by saying that I'm less than satisfied with the minister's response to this. But for the sake of proceeding, I'll leave it at that.

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clauses 7 and 8 agreed to.

Clause 9

Mr. Koskie: — I want to make a general comment on this. I think that it's commendable to have a clause setting out the basis of academic freedom. But I think that, in a lot of ways, it could be an exercise in futility, really, or smoke-screen's I guess the word I need. Because while you can set out that the university shall have certain exclusive powers in running the university - academic freedom - the whole question of course is whether or not a university has academic freedom to carry out its mandate and the formulation of establishing of their standards for admission and so on. I think it really comes to the commitment of any government in the funding to the universities and to say that a university basically will have its academic freedom. But that mandate certainly will, in the end, be curtailed to a large extent by any curtailment of funding.

And so I want to raise that point in respect to section 9. I think that I agree with setting out the basis of it. A couple of other questions, though, I'd like to ask the minister. In establishing this act, I wonder whether there was, for instance, in setting out the basic academic freedom clauses, was there any basic discussion with the academic community and the universities? Was there any comparison done with other legislation and other jurisdiction? Because what I'm interested in is whether the academic freedom set out here are as encompassing as the university academics would think desirable, and also, sort of the comparison with other jurisdictions.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm advised that it was discussed with the academic community and they advise that it was acceptable. That was resolved with regard to the question of

funding. You know, that obviously becomes a question to the appropriate minister when it comes into the question of estimates. I think that to say that the funding is not adequate steps on academic freedom. I think you're opening up a tremendous argument with regards to how you come about establishing a budget, of course. And to say that the legislature does not have the ultimate decision as to what the budget should be and clearly, if some members disagree on the particular allocations, and that's usually a question that would be discussed on grievance before supply in the committee of finance.

Clause 9 agreed to.

Clause 10

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, I just ask the minister why they decided on the limitation of \$500,000.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — As I understand, the previous legislation called for 250, and I could be mistaken there, \$250,000. Given inflation and given the costs of things, we provided a little more leeway by increasing it, and I suppose at some point in time, perhaps arbitrarily you pick a number, half a million dollars. Anything beyond that I suppose that's a fairly significant expenditure and probably could be reviewed.

Mr. Koskie: — That was no concern, and you partly addressed it, is that with the inflation and the increasing escalation of costs that it should be certainly raised and should be taken under consideration from time to time, in order that . . . Because, I mean let's face it, universities in the economic times are having difficulties right across Canada, and the question remains whether governments are going to adequately fund them or whether they're going to allow universities to establish a building program and an academic program through expenditures incurred by the university itself.

What I'm saying is there's a fair amount of power held by the government where they limit, for instance, to \$500,000 in respect to the purchase of land or the erection of any building, limit it to that, and at the same time, if the funding, the general funding, for the operating is limited and also the capital funding by the university is limited. And so what I am saying I accept what the minister has indicated. I would like his assurance that in fact it has been increased. I would be surprised if your officials didn't know for a fact that it was, and I would like that.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicated that it was certainly increased, but whether it was 250 or 300 before, I'm not sure. So it was increased significantly.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

Clause 12

Mr. Koskie: — I'm somewhat concerned with the limitation of liability in clause 12, and I wonder why in fact you are excluding the minister, or the principal, or the instructor of any institution approves or sponsors activities during instructional hours from apparently any liability whatsoever. I don't really see why you are doing that. I would have thought that an institution of that size would carry cover insurance for the

purposes of any liability. Where are you shifting the liability? Onto the individual student to go out and buy from the private sector and protect himself, or what is the purpose of this rather vicious clause that you have put in place here?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can advise the hon. member that the only thing added to it from the previous act was the minister . . . The interpretation was that the minister would have been caught in a catch-all, or other persons. To clarify it, the legal people advised that the minister should be added to that, and that's why it's put in there. I hardly think it would be credible to argue that the Hon. Mr. Currie, fine, upstanding man that he is, is likely to go over and create some liabilities. It's simply added the minister to what was already there before. I assume that when you folks were in government, you were happy with that particular section. It just adds the minister, to no other person.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I don't intend to rag the point, and I don't feel strongly about arraigning Mr. Currie in court - the member from Wascana. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't feel particularly strongly about getting him in irons. I'll take the minister at his word that the section is largely unchanged from what it was before, but I do think that these sections are obnoxious. I would suggest to the government that when you're re-enacting these legislation delete these cursed limitation sections. They serve no purpose at all, except to deny people remedies, and protect the officials.

For instance, Mr. Minister, if a gym instructor shows up drunk at a gym to instruct a gymnastics class - by way of example, let's pick something reasonably dangerous - a child's back is broken, or a student's back is broken, it's got no remedy against the instructor. Now, he may have a remedy against the institution, but to be able to sue the instructor could be a very important tactical advantage, because of course you can examine the instructor for discovery. I find this section obnoxious. I don't care who brought it in; I don't think that's relevant, frankly.

There was an election a year ago, and there is, I thought, a different administration in office. I say to you, Mr. Minister, that these limitation sections serve no purpose, except to protect the instructors from legitimate claims. If they're not legitimate claims, surely the courts will weed those out. So I'm not going to pursue the issue, but I do find these limitation sections objectionable.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think, as before, what I can undertake is that we will look at that and the whole legal interpretation. As you know, in the whole law of tort, you can end up with a lot of those problems, and the court procedure. We'll take that under advisement and look at it, and see.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 21

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to ask a question on this. Not long ago, it seems to me that we amended in this session The Department of Continuing Education Act. Is that not correct? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon? Yes, the former session. And I take it now that in putting into place this act, those amendments would not have been necessary, that is in respect to the revolving funds . . . superfluous acts that you brought in.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No, I think we went through that when those acts went through and were passed. It was clearly dealing with the previous year.

Clause 21 agreed to.

Clause 22 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 20 - An Act to amend The Department of Rural Affairs Act

Clause 1

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, with all the good things that the minister said this bill was going to do, from extending natural gas to growing grain out in the country, which I see very little of it in this bill and I doubt will ever happen through this bill - but I'd have to say that I would have to agree with the name change that the minister is proposing.

Mr. Shillington: — I just want to congratulate the government on their brevity. You've accomplished a magnificent number of things with a very few words and I would just urge that sort of brevity on you in other areas.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I suppose when one comes to how one deals as a government, one can look at bringing in a large amount of legislation that does this, this, this and this. Or one could look at bringing in programs or expenditures or the way we handle it or the way we deal with it as government. And I think that's the way most folks would judge how you're doing, good, bad or indifferent. And I suppose the process we ultimately come to is every four years we go to the people, and the people decide. The last time we went to the people, the results were obvious.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want a closing remark here. You know, the government may be congratulating itself in respect to the brevity of the act. But I want to say, Mr. Minister, that it's day 24 and all that you have put before us in respect to legislation, and I know there will be more legislation undoubtedly, is the reorganization of bills. And certainly we would like your attention of at least bringing forward the government's proposed legislation.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, we're clearly going to bring forth further legislation, that legislation will be introduced. Again I can go back, I suppose, and we can harangue and hassle all day about how many pieces of legislation we're going to bring in. I suppose the question becomes, and go back to what I said before, we believe that we have delivered a lot of programs, we have delivered on a lot of things that we said we were going to do, and I suppose that's how we see how we run government, as opposed to the number of pieces of legislation.

Mr. Shillington: — I want to reiterate what my colleague from Quill Lakes has said, and that is that this is just unprecedented to be in the 24th day of the session and to still have the order paper virtually empty except for the committee of finance. I frankly don't know what we'd do tomorrow morning if we didn't have the committee of finance, Mr. Minister. You are just very, very late in bringing that legislation forward, and I don't understand what's going on for the life of me.

You have held repeated press conferences, explaining what you're doing in various

areas. You're bringing in a trade union act, you're bringing in this and bringing in that, and yet we haven't seen the legislation. Some of it may be hung up somewhere, but I can't believe that some of the rest of it is. Like, I'll give you a for instance: there's an innocuous amendment to the workers' compensation board which would make the benefits that we approved last February retroactive. There's apparently a flaw in the bill. I had told the minister, and I've told the minister publicly in this Assembly, so it's on *Hansard*, 'Bring the amendment forward, and let's deal with it and get those people their money.' And what happens? Nothing. Nothing. I might as well have been talking to the great sand-hill as this government, because we haven't seen a thing.

And I want to urge the minister, who is Acting House Leader, to get your legislation on the order paper. I don't think you're being fair to the opposition.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I suppose . . . I was in opposition for four years. I was in opposition for four years and, quite frankly, what I waited for in those four-year period every day an opportunity to get in there and express my concerns with regard to the spending estimates and the spending plans of the government. What I'm hearing from the members opposite is, 'I don't want to talk about the budget, boys. I don't want to talk about the budget. Bring us in some bills that we can talk about because I don't want to talk about that budget.' I can only assume from that, I can only take from that, that that budget flowed so well there's nothing to attack and you don't want to talk about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 10 - An Act respecting The Department of Tourism and Small Business

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 8 - An Act to repeal The Department of Intergovernmental Affairs Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that that bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 9 - An Act respecting The Department of Supply and Services

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — With leave, Mr. Speaker, I move the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 11 - An Act to repeal The Educational Communications Corporation Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 12 - An Act to amend The Municipal Revenue Sharing Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 14 - An Act respecting The Department of Justice

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 15 - An Act respecting The Department of Parks and Renewable Resources

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — With leave, Mr. Speaker, I move they now be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move that this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 17 - An Act respecting The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 20 - An Act to amend The Department of Rural Affairs Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move this bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 26

Item 1

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 p.m.